




Docket No.: 250434US-2SX



COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ECKHARD H. KUESTERS
(703) 413-3000
EKUESTERS@OBLON.COM

SURINDER SACHAR
(703) 413-3000
SSACHAR@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/798,353

Applicants: Tetsuya KAWAGISHI, et al.

Filing Date: March 12, 2004

For: ULTRASONIC DIAGNOSTIC EQUIPMENT AND
ULTRASONIC IMAGE GENERATION METHOD

Group Art Unit: 3768

Examiner: JAWORSKI, F.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters

Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number


22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423

DOCKET NO: 250434US-2SX



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

:

TETSUYA KAWAGISHI ET AL.

:

EXAMINER: JAWORSKI, F.

SERIAL NO.: 10/798,353

:

FILED: MARCH 12, 2004

:

GROUP ART UNIT: 3768

FOR: ULTRASONIC DIAGNOSTIC
EQUIPMENT AND ULTRASONIC
IMAGE GENERATION METHOD

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction requirement of August 16, 2006, Applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I, Claims 1-8 and 18.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, a Restriction is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.


M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that each of the claims could be examined without an undue burden, and thus each of the noted inventions and claims should be examined on their merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Registration No. 28,870
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
EHK/SNS/des

I:\ATTY\SNS\25s\250434\250434US.REST.RESP..DOC